

Panaji, 31st October, 1974 (Kartika 9, 1896)

SERIES II No. 31

OFFICIAL GAZETTE



GOVERNMENT OF GOA, DAMAN AND DIU

GOVERNMENT OF GOA, DAMAN AND DIU

Special Department

Order

No. 5-1-74-SPL

In continuation of Govt. order no. SPL-PER-14 dated 7th November, 1973 published in the Official Gazette, Series II, No. 33 dated 15-11-1973 the term of deputation of Shri S. N. Kekre, as Director of Accounts, Goa is hereby extended for a further period of one year with effect from 4th November, 1974 on the existing terms and conditions.

This issues with the concurrence of the Accountant General, Maharashtra.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

M. K. Bhandare, Deputy Secretary (Appointments).

Panaji, 23rd October, 1974.

Order

No. 4-17-74-SPL

Shri S. R. Arya, Secretary (Revenue) shall hold the charge of the post of Secretary (Industries and Labour), in addition to his own duties, with immediate effect till Shri S. C. Pandey, Secretary (Ind. & Lab.) who is out of Headquarters resumes duties.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

M. K. Bhandare, Deputy Secretary (Appointments).

Panaji, 26th October, 1974.

Order

No. 3-24-74-SPL

Pending encadrement of the post of Excise Officer in the Excise Department under the Commissioner of Excise, in Schedule II of the Goa, Daman and Diu Civil Service, Shri G. G. Modcoicar, Excise Officer is transferred with immediate effect and until further orders to the post of Forest Settlement Officer, a grade II post included in the Schedule II of the same Service. This transfer will not give Shri Modcoicar any right of seniority in the cadre of Grade II officers of the said Service.

Shri Pukh Raj Bumb, Dy. Collector and Land Acquisition Officer is relieved with immediate effect of the additional duties of the Forest Settlement Officer entrusted to him under order of even number dated 26th August, 1974.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

M. K. Bhandare, Deputy Secretary (Appointments).

Panaji, 28th October, 1974.

Home Department (General)

Order

No. HD-44/78-71/Part II

In exercise of powers conferred by section 9 of the Maintenance of Internal Security Act, 1971 (26 of 1971), the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu hereby —

- (i) constitutes an Advisory Board for the purposes of the said Act;
- (ii) appoints Shri M. G. Chitale to be the Chairman and S/Shri Gustavo Couto and Sridhar Tamba to be the other members of the said Board.

This supersedes the earlier order No. HD-44-78/71-A dated the 29th December, 1971.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

G. M. Sardessai, Under Secretary (Home).

Panaji, 22nd October, 1974.

Order

No. HD(G)CONF-3/74

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 9 of the Maintenance of Internal Security Act, 1971 (26 of 1971) and in supersession of the Order No. HD-44-78-71/Part II dated 22nd October, 1974, the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu hereby constitutes the Advisory Board for the purposes of the said Act as follows: —

1. Shri M. G. Chitale, Retired High Court Judge of Bombay, High Court, 4 LANDS & HOUSE JAMNADAS METHA ROAD, BOMBAY-40006 — Chairman of the Board.
2. Shri Renato Noronha, Additional District and Sessions Judge, Panaji, Goa — Member of the Board.
3. Shri Shridhar Tamba, Advocate, Altinho, Panaji, Goa — Member of the Board.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

G. M. Sardessai, Under Secretary (Home).

Panaji, 26th October, 1974.

Education and Public Works Department

Notification

No. 13-32-742FOS(EDN)

Shri Manubhai Chunalal Shah a candidate recommended by Union Public Service Commission is hereby temporarily appointed to the post of Officer-in-charge of Training and Placement in Government Polytechnic with immediate effect

in the scale of Rs. 700-1150 plus the usual allowances admissible from time to time.

2. His initial pay shall be fixed according to rules.

3. The appointment is temporary and subject to the conditions specified in this Office Memorandum of even number dated 1-10-1974 and rules and regulations laid down by Government from time to time.

4. He will also continue to hold the present charge of Lecturer in Mech. Engineering until further orders.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu,

N. Rajasekhar, Under Secretary (Planning).

Panaji, 23rd October, 1974.

Corrigendum

No. PWD/3020/74/PE/EDN.PWD

Read: Government Notification No. PWD/3020/74/PE/EDN.PWD dated 2-9-1974.

The following amendment may be made at Sr. No. 8 of the above mentioned Notification.

Sr. No.	Name	Date from which is declared as Gazetted
8.	Shri R. Rediah	20-2-1973

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

N. Rajasekhar, Under Secretary (Planning).

Panaji, 24th October, 1974.

Public Works Department

Office of the Principal Engineer

Order

No. PWD/1477/53/74

Read: Report No. WDV/Adm-5/G-11/14/74-75 dated 25-7-1974, from the Executive Engineer, Works Division VI, P.W.D., Fatorda, Margao-Goa.

Sanction of the Government is hereby conveyed to the transfer of Pallolem Pattiwada Road in a length of 450 metres, in village Panchayat Nagorcem-Pallolem, Canacona Taluka to P.W.D., for its maintenance and repairs with immediate effect.

By order and in the name of the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

Balcrisna R. Naique, Principal Engineer, P.W.D., and Ex-Officio Addl. Secretary to the Govt.

Panaji, 14th October, 1974.

Order

No. PWD/1477/57/74

Read: — Report No. WDV/Adm-5/D-8/16/74-75 dated 12-8-1974, from the Executive Engineer, Works Division VI, P.W.D., Fatorda-Margao-Goa.

Sanction of the Government is hereby conveyed to the transfer of Bimvaddo to Gonsua Road in a length of 1.800 km., in Village Panchayat Betalbatim, Salcete Taluka to P.W.D., for its maintenance and repairs with immediate effect.

By order and in the name of the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

Balcrisna R. Naique, Principal Engineer, P.W.D., and Ex-Officio Addl. Secretary to the Government.

Panaji, 16th October, 1974.

Rural Development Department

Corrigendum

No. RDD/Coop/Deput/(NKA)/74/74/8531/8905

Read:—Govt. order No. RDD/Coop/Deput/(NKA)/74/74, dated 8-5-1974.

Consequent upon the resolution passed by the Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., Panaji, on 24-7-1974, to revise the pay scale of the post of Internal Auditor, held by Shri N. K. Avashia, Sr. Auditor, Registrar of Coop. Societies' Office, Panaji, on deputation to the Goa State Coop. Bank Ltd., the scale of pay mentioned in para (1) of the Govt. order referred to above may be read as Rs. 650-1200, with effect from 24-7-1974.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu,

Abel do Rosario, Under Secretary (Development).

Panaji, 23rd October, 1974.

Industries and Power Department

Notification

No. 5-73-72/IPD/MPS-29/50

Whereas the mining lease granted to Shri M. M. P. D'Souza under Title of Concession No. 29 dated 12-6-1950 for iron and manganese ores over an area of 90.5099 Ha. situated at Tivrem of Ponda Taluka was determined under Government Notification No. 5-73-72-IPD/MPS/29/50 dated 24-2-1973 for breach of the provisions of clause (b) of sub rule (1) of rule 37 of the Mineral Concession Rules, 1960.

And whereas the said Shri M. M. P. D'Souza filed a revision application to the Government of India against the said orders of the Government.

And whereas the Government of India, Ministry of Steel and Mines, New Delhi, under their letter No. MV-1(355)/73-Goa, dated 11-7-1974 allowing the revision application of Shri D'Souza have set aside the order of this Government dated 24-2-1973.

Now, therefore, after careful reconsideration of the case in respect of the title of concession No. 29 dated 12-6-1950 the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu, hereby condones the breach of the provisions of the Mineral Concession Rule, 1960 committed by Shri M. M. P. D'Souza and hereby in exercise of the powers under section 21 of the General clauses Act, 1897 cancels the Government Notification No. 5-73-72-IPD/MPS/29/50 dated 24-2-1973 with immediate effect.

By order and in the name of the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

P. Noronha, Under Secretary, Industries and Labour.

Panaji, 10th October, 1974.

Labour and Information Department

Order

No. CLE/1/ID(52)/71/IT-1/72-74

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu, on an Industrial Dispute between the Management of M/s. Auto Service, Sambhaji-Goa, and the workman employed by them, is hereby published as required vide provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (XIV of 1947).

P. Noronha, Under Secretary, Industries and Labour.

Panaji, 15th October, 1974.

Before Shri M. G. Chitale, Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu

Reference (IT-GDD) No. 2 of 1972

ADJUDICATION

Between

M/s. Auto Service, Sambhaji, (Goa).

And

Shri N. R. S. Almeida, a workman employed under them.

In the matter of reinstatement with back wages, etc.

Appearances:

Mr. Ramesh Desai, Labour Adviser, for the employers.
Mr. R. N. S. Almeida, Present in person.

AWARD

(14-5-1974)

This is a reference under Section 10(1)(d) read with Section 12 (5) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, relating to the dispute between M/s. Auto Service, Sambhaji, (Goa) (hereinafter referred to as the employers) and N. R. S. Almeida — an employee of that concern. The dispute referred to this Tribunal is thus worded:—

«Was Shri N. R. S. Almeida properly discharged from service by the Management of M/s. Auto Service, Sambhaji (Goa)?

If not, to what relief Shri N. R. S. Almeida is entitled?

2. In this case the employee — N. R. S. Almeida (hereinafter referred to as Almeida) appeared in person. He has filed three statements dated 12-5-1972, 11-6-1972 and 11-7-1972. These three statements are treated as statements of claim. These three statements are undoubtedly prolix. In substance, the allegations in these statements are:—

(i) Almeida was employed as an Accountant with the employers on or about 5-5-1964. Almeida served faithfully and sincerely as Accountant. During the course of his employment, in the interest of his job and profession, he made certain suggestions to the employers — with regard to irregularities in accounts — that came to his notice. He further suggested remedial measures to set right the irregularities, but this action of his offended the employers, who consequently bore grudge against him. On 21-4-1971 the employers compelled Almeida to stay on late in the evening and confined him in the cabin of the junior partner — Paresh Joshi, and thus restrained him from moving out even beyond office hours. Paresh Joshi threatened Almeida with dire consequence unless he wrote certain document to his dictation and signed the same. Being helpless Almeida had to yield to these threats. Because of this he suffered from nervous break-down and was unable to attend to his duties thereafter. He wrote letter dated 25-4-1971 quoting therein the medical certificate obtained by him. In this letter he requested the employers to arrange to send his salary by cheque. Thereafter Almeida's son wrote letter dated 3-5-1971 stating that his father was suffering from nervous break-down and inquired whether the employers would require a periodical medical report. Almeida received the employer's letter dated 30-4-1971 on 7-5-1971. This letter conveyed the acceptance of the alleged resignation submitted by Almeida on 20-4-1971. On receipt of this letter, Almeida wrote letter dated 10-5-1971 in which he alleged that the resignation was taken from him under duress. He further alleges in this letter that he was subjected to wrongful restraint and wrongful confinement after office hours upto 6.45 p. m. on 21-4-1971 and was forced to sign 2/3 papers. In this letter he further stated that the resignation was not accepted on or before 30-4-1971, hence the letter of resignation lapses, and subsequent acceptance of the resignation was of no avail, and he continued in service. On these allegations it is stated that Almeida has not resigned, that the acceptance of the resignation dated 30-4-1971 was void and inoperative, and he should be reinstated with continuity of service, back wages and other benefits. Almeida wrote his letter dated 7-6-1971 to the Labour Commissioner setting out his version. Thereupon conciliation proceedings were started.

3. In his statement of claim dated 11-7-1972 Almeida refers to the proceedings before the Labour Commissioner. In the statement of claim he denies that any enquiry was made by the employers on 20-4-1971, as stated by the employers before the Labour Commissioner. According to Almeida, on 21-4-1971 just about 20 minutes before 5.30 p. m., the closing time of the office, he was suddenly called by the junior partner in his cabin. As soon as he entered the cabin, he

was kept under wrongful restraint and wrongful confinement and was subjected to interrogation. His resignation was demanded. He refused to resign. According to him, he told the employers that he wanted to go at 5.30 p. m. so as to catch the train at 5.45 p. m. in order to attend upon his ailing son, but the employers did not accede to his request. He then repeats the facts mentioned above.

4. By their written statement the employers contend that in this case there is no industrial dispute which the State Government can refer to this Tribunal, Almeida was not discharged, he resigned, hence the reference is incompetent. It is further stated that no demand was served on the management, hence there cannot be any industrial dispute that can be referred to the Tribunal. According to the employers, on 20-4-1971 it was reported to them that Almeida destroyed some of their record, hence they carried on informal preliminary inquiry to verify the report. At this preliminary inquiry, according to the employers, on 20-4-1971 Almeida admitted having destroyed the Time Book. He was asked to put down in writing whatever he wanted to say, accordingly he made the confession — Ex. C-1 in writing. On 21-4-1971 Almeida came to the office, signed the muster roll, within a short time thereafter he handed over the letter of resignation, Ex. C-2, to the employer's Manager — Menon, and left the office. The employers deny the allegations that he was wrongfully restrained and wrongfully confined, and that the confession — Ex. C-1 and the resignation, Ex. C-2, were obtained from him under duress. According to the employers, during the preliminary enquiry, in Almeida's presence his drawer was searched and pieces of the torn time book were found in the drawer, as well as in his (Almeida's) pocket. The employers contend that Almeida has confessed his mistake in destroying the time book, and has voluntarily resigned, hence he is not entitled to any relief.

5. Almeida has submitted written arguments. I have gone through them.

6. At the hearing Mr. Ramesh Desai for the employers did not seriously press the preliminary point mentioned in the written statement. It is obvious from Almeida's letter dated 10-5-1971, Ex. U-4, that Almeida made it clear that the acceptance of resignation by the employers was of no consequence and he continued to be their employee as before. This letter can be treated as a demand on the employers. In any case, Almeida's letter dated 7-6-1971, Ex. U-8, written to the Labour Commissioner can certainly be treated as a demand letter, the failure report shows that the employers did resist that demand before the Labour Commissioner, thus it is clear that there was an industrial dispute prior to the date of reference, viz. 17-4-1972, — reference which is made on consideration of the failure report. It is also clear from Almeida's letter to the Secretary, Industries and Labour Department, Government of Goa, Daman and Diu, dated 17-5-1972, Appendix 'F' to Almeida's statement dated 12-5-1972 that there was a dispute raised by the employee before the State Government, which could be referred to the Tribunal by that Government. I, therefore, overrule the preliminary objection that there was no demand, hence no industrial dispute, and the reference is invalid.

7. The second preliminary objection raised is that the management has not discharged Almeida, he resigned, there can, therefore, be no dispute, hence the reference is bad in law. There is no substance in this objection also. It cannot be said that there is no dispute merely because there is a letter of resignation. It was alleged by the employee Almeida — that the letter of resignation, Ex. C-2, was taken from him under duress, and as this allegation was denied by the employers, it is obvious that there was a dispute which could be referred to the Tribunal.

8. According to the employers, it was reported to them that there was destruction of some record, hence informal preliminary enquiry was held and during that enquiry it transpired that time-book was destroyed. During that enquiry some pieces of torn time book were found in Almeida's drawer and in his pocket. Almeida was asked about it and he admitted to have destroyed the time book. The employers asked him to reduce to writing what he had to say and accordingly, the confession, Ex. C-1, was written by Almeida in his own hand on 20-4-1971. On the next day, i. e. 21-4-1971, Almeida came to the office, signed the muster roll, but within a short time tendered his resignation, Ex. C-2, and went away. In view of this version of the employers, it will be necessary to consider first whether it is established that time book was destroyed. Unless this fact is established, the confession, Ex. C-1 and the resignation, Ex. C-2, cannot

be relied upto by the employers. While considering this question, it is important to note that Almeida in his evidence admits that the junior partner, Paresh Joshi, asked him whether he had destroyed the time book. Almeida said «No». In view of this, it is clear that admittedly there was some sort of preliminary enquiry with regard to the destruction of record, particularly the time book. The only disputed point in this respect is whether the said enquiry took place on 20th or 21st April 1971. According to the employers it was on 20th, while according to Almeida, it was on 21st. According to Almeida, not only there was some sort of enquiry, but the two documents, confession, Ex. C-1, and the resignation, Ex. C-2, were extracted from him by wrongfully confining him and by exercising pressure on him. Almeida denies that he destroyed the time book. In the confession, Ex. C-1, there is, however, a clear admission that he destroyed the time book. In view of this, the important question to be considered is whether Almeida's allegation about confinement and duress is established.

9. I shall first consider the evidence led by the employers with regard to the alleged destruction of time book. On that point the junior partner, Paresh Joshi, has given evidence. In his examination-in-chief he confirms the version in this respect, as set out in the employers' written statement. Suggestion was made in the cross-examination that there was misappropriation in the employers' office, which was brought to the notice of the employers. This suggestion is neither denied, nor admitted by Paresh Joshi on the ground that he does not maintain accounts. According to Almeida, the employers felt offended because he pointed out irregularities in accounts and misappropriation, hence he was unwanted, and ultimately letter of resignation, Ex-C-2, was obtained from him. Beyond this suggestion there is no material before me which could render this suggestion probable. Paresh Joshi, however, denies that any irregularities in accounts were pointed out to him individually. Paresh Joshi in his cross-examination admits that the preliminary enquiry was oral, no record about that enquiry was maintained. According to Paresh Joshi, one Rege gave him information that time book was destroyed. In view of this information, he started the preliminary enquiry. He has stated that many employees—though not all—were questioned to ascertain whether the information received was correct or incorrect. Paresh Joshi has stated that Prakash Naik handed over some pieces of torn time book to him. So also he noticed some pieces lying outside the window of his cabin. According to Paresh Joshi, Prakash Naik told him that he had seen Almeida throwing away torn pieces in the gutter. It was after this enquiry that Almeida was called and questioned. Paresh Joshi further says that at that time Almeida's drawer was opened in his presence, and some pieces of torn time book were found in that drawer, as well as in his (Almeida's) pocket. He asked Almeida not to repeat such an act. After this Almeida wrote the confession, Ex.C-1 and left office. Paresh Joshi denies that he threatened Almeida with publicity to the incident. He denies that the date in the confession was tampered with, as alleged by Almeida. He further denies that he dictated the contents of the confession. Paresh Joshi says that the time book was not a very important document from the business point of view, hence he did not record Panchnama with regard to the finding of pieces of torn time book in Almeida's drawer. Cross-examination shows that the employers had a duplicate key. Almeida's suggestion is that the pieces of torn time book may have been planted in his drawer previously, and then a show was made by finding those pieces in his presence. Paresh Joshi says that when pieces of torn time book were found in Almeida's drawer, he told Almeida that it should not have happened and asked him to reduce to writing what he had done. There is nothing in the cross-examination of Paresh Joshi to indicate why a totally false charge should be levelled by him against Almeida. The only suggestion made by Almeida mentioned above does not seem to be probable on the evidence before me.

10. In order to negative Almeida's suggestion mentioned above, the employers have examined Uttam Narsinh Vene, Chartered Accountant. In his evidence he says that he has been auditing the employers' accounts since 1967. During his audit Almeida did not bring to his notice any misappropriation by any of the partners. In the cross-examination it is brought out that depreciation on the houses was not included in the balance sheet, which Vene however, explained by stating that houses do not belong to the partnership. According to him, the houses are shown as property of one of the partners. Vene, however, admits that in the balance sheet for the year 1969-70, depreciation was claimed on the portion of the house occupied by the business, this was, however, not allowed by tax authorities, hence in the sub-

sequent year depreciation was not claimed. It was suggested in the cross-examination that rent for the shop of Joshi Brothers was debited to the accounts of Auto Service. Vene says that he did not notice any such debit, nor was it brought to his notice by any one. Beyond the suggestion there is nothing in Vene's evidence to disclose irregularities in the accounts or any misappropriation.

11. The employers have examined their Manager—Menon. Admittedly, he was present in the cabin of Paresh Joshi when the confession, Ex. C-1, was written by Almeida. In his examination-in-chief Menon supports the employers' version in the written statement. In the cross-examination he says that he does not know whether Almeida made any suggestions on accounts to the employers. He was asked why he remembers that the enquiry was on 20th April, and not on 21st April. Menon stated that he remembers it because there was preliminary enquiry and the confession, Ex. C-1, was tendered. Menon admits that when other employees were questioned, Almeida was not present, and he was the last person to be questioned. He admits that he and Paresh Joshi were the only persons besides Almeida, when he (Almeida) wrote the confession, Ex. C-1. He denies the suggestion that Almeida's drawer was searched in his absence with the duplicate key which he had. Cross-examination of Menon does not disclose any personal animosity. There seems to be no reason why he should join hands with the partner of the employers' firm to implicate Almeida.

12. Almeida denies the allegation that he tore the time book and destroyed it. In his cross-examination he admits that after Paresh Joshi asked him some questions, which according to him was on 21-4-1971, his drawer was opened in his presence, but he denies that pieces of torn time book were found in that drawer.

13. It is urged that although it is alleged by the employers that several employees were questioned during the preliminary enquiry, none of them, except Menon, is examined, hence adverse inference should be drawn against the employers. As stated above, these employees were questioned only to get confirmed the information that was received by Paresh Joshi. Who gave the information would not be material. As pointed out above, no motive is brought out to indicate why Menon should falsely implicate Almeida in a false charge. The other employees were admittedly not present when Almeida was questioned, and the confession, Ex. C-1, was written. In view of this, the evidence of the other employees would not be material. I do not, therefore, think that it would be proper to draw any adverse inference against the employers because none of the other employees, besides Menon, is examined.

14. The fact that there was some sort of preliminary enquiry is admitted by Almeida, the only point in dispute is whether such enquiry took place on 20-4-1971 or 21-4-1971. According to Almeida it was on 21-4-1971, when two documents the confession, Ex. C-1 and the resignation, Ex. C-2 were extracted from him under coercion. According to Almeida the date is tampered with in the confession at two places. This allegation is denied by the employers. I have carefully examined the confession, Ex. C-1, particularly the two places where Almeida alleges alterations. These two alterations are—one above his signature and one below his signature. The date 20-4-1971 above Almeida's signature does not appear to be capable of a definite conclusion in this respect, but the date 20-4-1971 below his signature is quite clear, and in my opinion, negatives the allegation regarding alterations. I have examined figure '1' written by Almeida at several places in the letters, written arguments, etc., and I find that figure '1' he writes is mostly a straight vertical stroke without any curve at the bottom, while in figure '20' below his signature in the confession, Ex. C-1, there is a distinct curve to the right. It is, in my opinion, unlikely that in the date below his signature there is any alteration. The zero in figure '20' below the signature seems to have been written in a fascile manner and there is no indication whatever of any alteration in that figure. Besides the disputed figures there is figure '1' at three places in the confession, Ex. C-1, itself. Two out of these figures—1—are clear vertical strokes with no curve at the bottom. The third has a slight curve at the bottom to the left, but not to the right. For the reasons stated above, I am unable to believe Almeida's allegation that figure '1' out of figure '21' (if it was '21') is altered to '0' by adding a curve. In view of this conclusion, I have no doubt that the preliminary enquiry must have been held on 20-4-1971, and not on 21-4-1971, as alleged by Almeida.

15. The next question for consideration is whether Almeida establishes his allegation that the two documents, confession, Ex. C-1, and resignation, Ex. C-2 were taken from him by

coercion. According to Almeida, he was called by Paresh Joshi—junior partner—in his cabin at about 5.10 p. m. Office hours are over by 5.30 p. m. According to Almeida, he was questioned by Paresh Joshi whether he (Almeida), destroyed the time book. Almeida stated «No». Almeida in his evidence says:—

«I told Mr. Paresh Joshi that such a question should not have been put to me orally, I should have been served with a written memo.»

I have quoted this statement of Almeida just to show that he does not appear to be a meek and submissive person. According to Almeida his son had met with an accident, he was ailing and needed attention. Almeida, therefore, wanted to leave the office at 5.30 p. m., go home immediately and attend upon his son. He was, however, not allowed to go home at 5.30 p. m., but he was detained till 6.45 p. m., with the result that he had no train to go to his village—Cuncolim, and was required to stay over night at Vasco. According to Almeida, he was in highly disturbed state of mind, as he was not allowed to go home and attend upon his son. In the first place, it is not even Almeida's version that his son suffered an accident on 20-4-1971 or 21-4-1971. Admittedly, the accident was prior to that and it is difficult to believe that he (Almeida) would be in such a disturbed state of mind, merely because he was detained in the office beyond office hours for an hour and quarter that he would helplessly sign the confession, Ex. C-1, and resignation, Ex. C-2, to the dictation of others. It is for considering probabilities in this respect that I have quoted above Almeida's statement to show that he cannot be classified as meek and submissive person. It is further urged by Almeida that he was wrongfully confined till 6.45 p. m. This is a highly exaggerated version. According to the employers also, Almeida was detained for about 15/20 minutes after office hours. It is quite probable that once Paresh Joshi started questioning Almeida with regard to destruction of the time book, he would not allow him to go just because office time was over, and would ask him not to leave until he had replied to the questions put to him. This, however, cannot be described as wrongful confinement. Even Almeida's evidence does not disclose that there was any physical obstruction. There is nothing to show that he attempted to go, but was physically prevented from going. The probability is that Almeida knew very well that if he tried to escape, suspicion against him would be stronger, hence he does not seem to have made any attempt to leave office at 5.30 p. m. disregarding the instruction of Paresh Joshi. Assuming that Almeida's son was ailing due to accident and needed attention, and that Almeida would have liked to go and attend upon him, the question for consideration is whether his inability to go and attend upon his son disturbed him to such an extent that he would meekly submit and admit destruction of time book, even though he had not done it. One can understand that if it was the case that while Almeida was in the office, he received news of accident to his son on the very day on which he was questioned, he would be in a highly excited mood and would do anything not knowing what had happened to his son. As pointed out, it is not even Almeida's version that the accident was on the same day. It was prior. Moreover no evidence is brought on record to show that the condition of his son was so serious that even detention for a short period should disturb him to such an extent that he would go to the extent of writing the confession, Ex. C-1, which according to him, was totally false. In fact he would not have attended office if his son's condition was precarious. Moreover according to Almeida's own version, this is not a case of extracting a document containing one or two lines. According to him, confession was dictated, but that draft was cancelled and there was another dictation. He further says that resignation was also extracted. His evidence shows that all this must be going on for a considerable time and it is impossible to accept the suggestion that he meekly submitted to all this. Almeida's evidence in this respect reads thus:—

«I was in a very much depressed state of mind when I wrote the three documents, firstly because I was implicated for tearing off Time Book, secondly because I was not allowed to go at 5.30 p. m., I was actually wrongfully detained. And thirdly because I was told by Paresh Joshi that it was my last day of the office. I was told that I would not be allowed to leave the office unless I sign the required documents».

None of the grounds disclosed by the above statement seems to be such a cogent ground that Almeida would be driven

to meek submission and sign a document containing false confession.

16. The burden to establish that confession, Ex. C-1 and resignation, Ex. C-2, were extracted from Almeida under coercion would be on Almeida. The evidence consists of his bare interested word. The allegations of coercion are denied by Paresh Joshi and Menon, who are examined on behalf of the employers. On the bare interested word of Almeida, I am unable to hold that the two documents, confession, Ex. C-1, and resignation, Ex. C-2, were taken from him by Paresh Joshi under coercion.

17. There is another aspect which supports the above conclusion that the two documents, confession, Ex. C-1, and resignation Ex. C-2 were not taken under coercion. According to Almeida, what happened on 21-4-1971 caused his nervous break-down. The question for consideration is whether this allegation that he was suffering from nervous break-down to such an extent that he could not even write a letter stating that the two documents, confession Ex. C-1 and resignation Ex. C-2 were taken from him under coercion. Almeida wrote the letter dated 25-4-1971, Ex. U-1, to the employers. No medical certificate was attached to this letter, but the letter itself quotes the contents of the medical certificates, which are as follows:—

«This is to certify that Mr. N. R. S. Almeida who is suffering from nervous break down needs to be treated and given rest. He is advised to absent from work during the treatment».

The certificate as quoted in this letter does not mention from what date Almeida started suffering from nervous break down. Doctor who issued the certificate is not examined. This letter further requests the employers to send him (Almeida's) salary by cheque. This clearly shows that the alleged nervous break-down was not such that he could not think of even his urgent matters. If Almeida had the presence of mind inspite of the alleged nervous break-down to request the employers to send his salary by cheque, it is difficult to understand why he could not write a few lines telling the employers that they had extracted confession—Ex. C-1 and resignation—Ex. C-2 on 21-4-1971. If the confession, Ex. C-1 was false, and if it was correct that the said two documents were taken from Almeida by coercion, one would expect him to write immediately the very next day that those documents were taken by coercion. Almeida, however, sat silent till 25-4-1971. Even the letter dated 25-4-1971, Ex. U-1, is completely silent over the confession and resignation.

18. The next letter dated 3-5-1971, Ex. U-2, is written by Almeida's son. In this letter also confession and resignation are conspicuously absent. This letter merely inquires of the employers whether they would require periodical medical certificate during Almeida's illness. It is impossible to believe that Almeida suffered from such nervous break-down that he could not write correct facts to the employers with regard to the confession and resignation. Moreover the last sentence in Ex. U-2 reads thus:—

«My father states he has not received any communication from since 21st of April, 1971».

This sentence necessarily shows that Almeida had in his mind what happened on 21-4-1971. Yet he does not come out with his version as to confession and resignation. In the other hand, by the above quoted sentence Almeida wanted to convey that the employers had not accepted the resignation even though 30-4-1971 had expired. The failure to communicate his version regarding confession and resignation upto 7-6-1971 is a very strong circumstance indicating that the said version cannot be correct. It was only by his letter dated 7-6-1971, Ex. U-8, that Almeida came out with the allegation that the two documents were taken by coercion. It is important to note that even in this letter rather than emphasising that the documents were taken by coercion, he contended that resignation which was to be effective from 1-5-1971 was not accepted before that date, hence the acceptance was ineffective.

19. It is necessary to mention here that although the letter, Ex. U-3, accepting the resignation is dated 30-4-1971, the evidence clearly establishes that it was posted on 6-5-1971 and Almeida received it on 7-5-1971, which provoked the above letter—Ex. U-8. There is, therefore, considerable force in Almeida's contention that the letter accepting the resigna-

tion may have been written after the employers received Almeida's son's letter — Ex. U-2 dated 3-5-1971, but was ante-dated. There is no substance in the contention that acceptance of resignation becomes ineffective because it was accepted on 6-5-1971. The acceptance of resignation would have been ineffective if Almeida had withdrawn his resignation, in Ex. C-2 before it was accepted. Delayed acceptance of resignation would require the employers to pay Almeida his salary upto the date of acceptance, but merely on the ground of late acceptance, it cannot be held that the acceptance of resignation is inoperative.

20. In view of the conclusions recorded above, it is clear that Almeida wrote the confession, Ex. C-1, voluntarily, presumably finding himself confronted with cogent evidence of his wrongful act. It is, in my opinion, also clear that having tendered the confession, Ex. C-1, he did not like to continue in service and voluntarily tendered his resignation Ex. C-2, on 21-4-1971.

21. I must mention here that Almeida contended that he worked in office on 21-4-1971 for the whole day, and not upto only 12 noon, as alleged by the employers. According to the employers, on 21-4-1971 Almeida came at 9.00 a.m. — usual time — signed the muster roll, soon thereafter tendered his resignation — Ex. C-2 and left office by 12 noon. Almeida in support of his contention relied on Menon's statement: «It may be that Mr. Almeida signed some letters on 21-4-1971». This statement by itself does not indicate that Almeida worked in the office for the whole day. He may have signed some letters before 12 noon when he left the office. Even assuming that Almeida worked for the whole day on 21-4-1971, that would not make any difference, if the resignation, Ex. C-2 was voluntarily tendered, as the resignation was to be effective from 1-5-1971. This contention was raised mainly to show that the employers' evidence is unreliable. For reasons indicated above, I am unable to hold that the employers' evidence is unreliable and deserves to be wholly rejected on that ground. In view of my conclusion that resignation, Ex. C-2, was voluntarily tendered by Almeida, demand for reinstatement and back wages cannot be granted. Almeida has, however, contended that his legal dues were not paid by the employers. Ramesh Desai for the employers stated that if the legal dues are not already paid, they will be paid by the employers. Almeida will be entitled to his salary upto and inclusive of 6-5-1971, as he received the letter of acceptance of resignation dated 30-4-1971 on 7-5-1971. So also Almeida will be entitled to the salary for the accumulated leave, but not enjoyed. If the employers had any provision for provident fund and gratuity in April 1971, Almeida will be entitled to those benefits also. Subject to this, the

demand for reinstatement and back wages is rejected. Award accordingly. No order as to costs.

Sd/-

M. G. CHITALE
Industrial Tribunal

Order

No. LC/1/ID(176)/73/1248

In partial modification of Government Notification No. LC/1/ID(176)/73/270 dated 28th February, 1974, published in the Official Gazette No. 50, Series II, dated 14-3-1974, the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu hereby directs that the Court of Inquiry as referred to in the above Notification shall complete its inquiry and submit its report to the Government upto 31-12-1974.

By order and in the name of the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

P. Noronha, Under Secretary, Industries and Labour.
Panaji, 21st October, 1974.

Notification

No. 1/169/73/LAB/1239

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 5 of the Factories Act, 1948 (53 of 1948) the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu hereby exempts the Government Printing Press, Panaji from the operation of Sections 51, 52, 53, 54 and 56 of the said Act for the period of three months from 1st October, 1974 subject to the following conditions namely:—

- (1) the worker shall not be allowed to work for more than 11 hours on any day;
- (2) the period of work of a worker shall be so arranged that they shall not spread over more than 18 hours on any day in each shift.

By order and in the name of the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

P. Noronha, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).
Panaji, 21st October, 1974.

Revenue Department

Notification

No. RD/LQN/82/74

Whereas by Government Notification No. RD/LQN/82/74 dated 23-4-74 published on page 47 of Series II, No. 5 of the Government Gazette, dated 2-5-74 it was notified under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as «the said Act») that the land, specified in the schedule appended to the said Notification (hereinafter referred to as the «said land») was likely to be needed for the public purpose viz. Flight of steps to Maruti Temple at Queula.

And whereas the appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as «the Government») is satisfied after considering

the report made under sub-section (2) of Section 5A of the said Act, that the said land specified in the schedule hereto is needed to be acquired for the public purpose specified above.

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to declare under the provisions of Section 6 of the said Act that the said land is required for the public purpose specified above.

2. The Government is also pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Dy. Collector, Margao to perform the functions of a Collector for all proceedings hereinafter to be taken in respect of the said land, and to direct him under Section 7 of the said Act to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the said land can be inspected at the office of the said Dy. Collector Margao till the award is made under Section 11.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka	Village	Plot No.	Survey No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Ponda	Queula	—	78/part	Maruthi Temple authorities, Quenla, Ponda.	768.00
Total					768.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. R. Arya, Secretary (Revenue).
Panaji, 19th October, 1974.

Notification

No. RD/LQN/260/74

Whereas it appears to the Appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as «the Government») that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the «said land») is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. for Kalay Government Farm (additional area).

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the «said Act») that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the said land by sale, lease, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette, in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Land Acquisition Officer, Collector's Office, Panaji, to perform the functions of a Collector under the said Act, in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under sub-section (2) of Section 4 of the said Act, the following officers, to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land:

1. Collector of Goa, Panaji.
2. The Land Acquisition Officer, Collector's Office, Panaji.
3. The Director of Agriculture, Panaji.
4. The Director of Land Survey, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the office of the Land Acquisition Officer, Collector's Office, Panaji, for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka	Village	Plot No.	Survey No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Sanguem	Calem	—	157 part	Shri Anand Vithoba Saunto Dessai. 2. Shri Dattaram Shaba Saunto Dessai. 3. Shri Dharma Saunto Dessai. 4. Shri Laxman Cuntcar. 5. Shri Purshottam Cuntcar.	1,12,190.00
<p>Boundaries:</p> <p>North: Government land held by Southern Rly. South: Public Road. East: Survey No. 153 part. West: Existing Agri. Farm.</p>					
Total					1,12,190.00

By order and in the name of the Lieutenant Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. R. Arya, Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 19th October, 1974.

Notification

No. RD/LQN/223/74

Whereas it appears to the Appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as «the Government»), that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the «said land») is likely to be needed for public purpose viz. construction of Internal Road at Opa, Candepar.

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the «said Act») that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the said land by sale, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise, or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect

under Section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette, in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act the Land Acquisition Officer, Collector's Office, Panaji, to perform the functions of a Collector under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under Sub-Section (2) of Section 4 of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector of Goa, Panaji.
2. The Land Acquisition Officer, Panaji.
3. The Superintending Engineer I, Circle I, P.W.D., Panaji.
4. The Executive Engineer Works Division IX, Tonca, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the Office of the Land Acquisition Officer, Collector's Office, Panaji, for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE
(Description of the said land)

Taluka	Village	Plot No.	Survey No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Ponda	Candepar	1	—	Shri Ganapat V. Gaonkar, Opp. Water Works, Oppa, P.W.D.	795.00
Boundaries:					
North: Govt. Land (C. I. pipe line).					
South: Khandepar Oppa Road.					
East: Government land.					
West: Government land.					
Total					795.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. R. Arya, Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 19th October, 1974.

Notification

No. RD/LQN/266/74

Whereas it appears to the Appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as «the Government») that the land specified in the schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the «said land») is likely to be needed for public purpose viz Construction of Approach Road to the Forest Rest House.

Therefore the Government is pleased to notify under sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as the «said Act») that the said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contracts for the disposal of the said land by sale, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise, or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed in paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this Notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act, be disregarded by him, while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under Section 6 of the said Act will be published in the Official Gazette, in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will be notified.

4. The Government is further pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act the Land Acquisition Officer, Collector's Office, Panaji, to perform the functions of a Collector under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government is also pleased to authorise under sub-section (2) of Section 4 of the said Act, the following officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector of Goa, Panaji.
2. The Land Acquisition Officer, Collector's Office, Panaji.
3. The Conservator of Forests, Panaji.
4. The Director of Land Survey, Panaji.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the Office of the Land Acquisition Officer, Collector's Office, Panaji, for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

SCHEDULE
(Description of the said land)

Taluka	Village	Plot No.	Survey No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Ponda	Quevla	1	361	Shri Amarnath Boto Doulokar, Dhauli, Ponda	2300.00
Boundaries:					
North: Government Forest					
South: Public Main Road					
East and West: Property of Shri Amarnath Boto Doulokar.					
Total					2300.00

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. R. Arya, Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 24th October, 1974.

Notification

No. RD/LQN/176/71

Whereas by Government Notification No. RD/LQN/176/71 dated 17-11-71 published on page 245-246 of Series II, No. 36 of the Government Gazette, dated 2-12-71 it was notified under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter

referred to as «the said Act») that the land, specified in the schedule appended to the said Notification (hereinafter referred to as the «said land») was likely to be needed for the public purpose viz. Salaulim Irrigation Project (Submergence area) Salaulim Village Part II.

And whereas the appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as «the Government») is satisfied after considering

the report made under sub-section (2) of Section 5A of the said Act, that the said land specified in the schedule hereto is needed to be acquired for the public purpose specified above.

Now, therefore, the Government is pleased to declare under the provisions of Section 6 of the said Act that the said land is required for the public purpose specified above.

2. The Government is also pleased to appoint under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Special Land Acquisition

Officer for Salaulim Irrigation Project, Panaji, to perform the functions of a Collector for all proceedings hereinafter to be taken in respect of the said land, and to direct him under Section 7 of the said Act to take order for acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the said land can be inspected at the office of the Collector of Goa, Panaji and Mamlatdar's Office Sanguem till the award is made under Section 11.

SCHEDULE
(Description of the said land)

Taluka	Village	Plot No.	Survey No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested H — Holder T — Tenant	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3	4	5	6
Sanguem	Salaulim	86	—	H — Shri Vassant Nadkarni & Bros.	3,320
— do —	— do —	87	—	H — Shri Vassant Nadkarni & Bros. T — Shri Harischandra S. Naik.	2,360
— do —	— do —	88	—	H — Shri Vassant Nadkarni & Bros. T — Shri Rama Babu Naik.	335
— do —	— do —	89	—	H — Shri Vassant Nadkarni & Bros.	2,350
— do —	— do —	90	—	H — Shri Vassant Nadkarni & Bros. T — Shri Babuso C. Naik.	1,500
— do —	— do —	91	—	H — Shri Vassant Nadkarni & Bros. T — Shri Rama Babu Naik.	1,500
— do —	— do —	92	—	H — Shri Vassant Nadkarni & Bros. T — Shri Uttam Ganesh Naik.	1,560
— do —	— do —	93	—	H — Shri Vassant Nadkarni & Bros. T — Shri Vithal S. Naik.	180
— do —	— do —	94	—	H — Shri Vassant Nadkarni & Bros.	1,280
— do —	— do —	95	—	H — 1. Shaikh Abdul Shacur. 2. Shaikh Ali Shaheb.	11,520
— do —	— do —	96	—	H — 1. Shaikh Isak. 2. Abdul Shacur. 3. Alisaheb.	2,240
— do —	— do —	97	—	H — Shri Arun Khan.	4,240
— do —	— do —	98	—	H — Shaikh Alisaheb. 2. Shaikh Abdul Shakur.	16,360
— do —	— do —	99	—	H — 1. Shaikh Alisaheb. 2. Shaikh Abdul Shakur.	7,500
— do —	— do —	100	—	H — 1. Shaikh Alisaheb. 2. Shaikh Abdul Shakur. 3. Shaikh Hamza. 4. Shaikh Abdul Wahab.	0,200
— do —	— do —	101	—	H — Shaikh Issac.	0,940
— do —	— do —	102	—	H — Shaikh Issac.	0,370
— do —	— do —	103	—	H — Khadar Khan. 2. Shaikh Alisaheb.	19,100
— do —	— do —	104	—	H — Murlidhar M. Nadkarni. 2. Bhiku M. Nadkarni.	34,560
— do —	— do —	105	—	H — Shaikh Issac.	1,450
— do —	— do —	106	—	H — Francisco Xavier Azaredo.	7,900
— do —	— do —	107	—	H — Dinanath Anant Nadkarni. Vasant Nadkarni.	8,950
— do —	— do —	108	—	H — Dinanath Anant Nadkarni.	0,980
— do —	— do —	109	—	H — Lourenco Sebastiao Francisco Xavier Raul Vaz Lima.	0,080
— do —	— do —	110	—	H — Lourenco Sebastiao Francisco Xavier Raul Vaz Lima.	0,015
— do —	— do —	111	—	H — Vasant Nadkarni.	0,450
— do —	— do —	112	—	H — Lourenco Sebastiao Francisco Xavier Raul Vaz Lima.	11,280
— do —	— do —	113	—	H — Dinanath Anant Nadkarni. 2. Vasant Nadkarni.	0,140
— do —	— do —	114	—	H — Vasant Nadkarni.	0,275
— do —	— do —	115	—	H — Dinanath Anant Nadkarni.	2,150
— do —	— do —	116	—	H — Babani Y. S. Dessai.	21,400
— do —	— do —	117	—	H — Smt. Umabai Kashinath Nadkarni.	5,730
— do —	— do —	118	—	H — Sazu Raghoba S. Nadkarni.	4,300
— do —	— do —	119	—	H — Shivaji D. Nadkarni.	0,360
— do —	— do —	120	—	H — Lourenco Sebastiao Francisco Xavier Raul Vaz Lima.	63,400

1	2	3	4	5	6
Sanguem	Salaulim	121	—	H — Lourenco Sebastiao Francisco Xavier Raul Vaz Lima.	0,640
— do —	— do —	122	—	H — Babani Y. S. Dessal.	1,175
— do —	— do —	123	—	H — Lourenco Sebastiao Francisco Xavier Raul Vaz Lima.	11,725
— do —	— do —	124	—	H — Babani Y. S. Dessal.	40,570
— do —	— do —	125	—	H — Lourenco Sebastiao Francisco Xavier Raul Vaz Lima.	7,150
— do —	— do —	127	—	H — Francisco Xavier Azaredo.	1,930
— do —	— do —	128	—	H — Francisco Xavier Azaredo.	27,300
— do —	— do —	129	—	H — Francisco Xavier Azaredo.	24,100
— do —	— do —	130	—	H — Francisco Xavier Azaredo.	2,120
Grand Total					4,14,125

By order and in the name of the Lt. Governor of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. R. Arya, Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 19th October, 1974.

Finance (Revenue) Department

Notification

No. Fin(Rev)/2-41/Part/9/74

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 5 of the Goa, Daman and Diu Entertainment Tax Act, 1964, Government is pleased to exempt from the payment of Entertainment Tax the tickets issued for four Musical Shows organised by Santeri Natya Sangh, Khorlim, Mapusa to be staged in Goa at the following places on dates shown against them:—

Place	Date
1. Sambhaji	6-11-1974
2. Margao	7-11-1974
3. Panaji	8-11-1974
4. Mapusa	9-11-1974

2. The exemption is subject to the condition that the entire proceeds accrued from the Musical Shows without deduction of expenses are credited to the funds of Santeri Natya Sangh, Khorlim, Mapusa and are utilised for its activities only.

3. The Secretary, Santeri Natya Sangh, Khorlim, Mapusa, should maintain the accounts and submit to the Commissioner of Entertainment Tax, Panaji, as and when the same are required by her.

4. All the tickets proposed to be sold for the Musical Shows should bear the seal of the prescribed officer or of his office.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. S. Sukthankar, Under Secretary (Finance).

Panaji, 22nd October, 1974.

Notification

No. Fin(Rev)/2-41/Part/9/3064/74

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of Section 5 of the Goa, Daman and Diu Entertainment Tax Act, 1964, Government is pleased to exempt from the payment of Entertainment Tax the tickets issued for the konkani drama «Burguim ani Bangar» organised by the Secretary, Sporting Club of Colva to be staged in Goa at the following places on dates and time shown against them:

Sr. No.	Place	Date	Time
1.	Mapusa	8-11-74	10.30 p. m.
2.	Margao	9-11-74	10.30 p. m.
3.	Ponda	10-11-74	10.30 p. m.
4.	Sambhaji	11-11-74	10.30 p. m.
5.	Panaji	12-11-74	10.30 p. m.
6.	Mapusa	15-11-74	10.30 p. m.

2. The exemption is subject to the condition that the entire proceeds accrued from the drama without deduction of expenses are credited to the funds of Sporting Club of Colva and are utilized for its activities only.

3. The Secretary, Sporting Club of Colva should maintain the accounts and submit to the Commissioner of Entertainment Tax, Panaji, as and when the same are required by her.

4. All the tickets proposed to be sold for this drama should bear the seal of the prescribed officer or of his office.

By order and in the name of the Administrator of Goa, Daman and Diu.

S. S. Sukthankar, Under Secretary (Finance).

Panaji, 26th October, 1974.